

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 22-25 are added. Support for the amendments and additions can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraphs [0022]-[0025]. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. (ConNexus Awarenex: Extending awareness to mobile users, by John C. Tang, et al. March 4, 2001) in view of Manabe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,584,494). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The teachings of Tang et al. are generally directed toward extending awareness to mobile users by integrating awareness information, instant messaging, and other communication channels in an interface that runs on a desktop computer or on a wireless handheld device. In particular, the Examiner relies on Tang et al. to teach: (a) a schedule publication element acquiring schedule information from users; (b) a schedule management element (in the form of a contact list) receiving the schedule information from the publication element; and a schedule distribution element (in the form of a contact toolbar) receiving integrated schedule information from the management element and storing subscriber information from a subscribing element identifying subscribers to which to disseminate the schedule information. However, Tang et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a schedule distribution element that effects the dissemination of presence and availability to subscribers by distributing

schedule information according to at least two different modes, wherein one of the modes more restrictively distributes the schedule information than another of the modes.

The teachings of Manabe et al. are generally directed toward communication support. In particular, the Examiner relies on Manabe et al. to teach registration services in the form of a registry system by which users are registered to receive information. However, Manabe et al. do not teach, suggest, or motivate a schedule distribution element that effects the dissemination of presence and availability to subscribers by distributing schedule information according to at least two different modes, wherein one of the modes more restrictively distributes the schedule information than another of the modes.

Applicants' claimed invention is generally directed toward automated dissemination of presence and availability schedules. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed toward a schedule distribution element that effects the dissemination of presence and availability to subscribers by distributing schedule information according to at least two different modes, wherein one of the modes more restrictively distributes the schedule information than another of the modes. For example, independent claim 1, especially as amended, recites, "said schedule distribution element effects the dissemination of presence and availability to said subscribers by distributing schedule information according to at least two different modes, wherein one of the modes more restrictively distributes the schedule information than another of the modes." Thus, Tang et al. and Manabe et al. do not teach, suggest,

or motivate all of the limitations of the independent claim 1. These differences are significant.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claim dependent therefrom.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 21, 2006

By:   
Gregory A. Stobbs  
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GAS/JSB/kup